

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/714,430

Applicant(s)

RIGNEY ET AL.

Examiner

David Turocy

Art Unit

1762

## All Participants:

(1) David Turocy.

(2) Christine Wilkes Beninati.

## Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 24 October 2005

Time: 11:00 am

## Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

*independent claims*

Prior art documents discussed:

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

## Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner inquired with Ms. Wilkes Beninati about a claim clarification, where the phrase "without a weight penalty" was clarified. Ms. Wilkes Beninati clarified a weight penalty exists if the post coated wieght is greater then the weight prior to engine run. Therefore the phrase "without a weight penalty" is to be read as requiring the weight after repair to be no greater then the weight prior to the first engine run.